

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

After the foregoing Amendment, claims 39-44 are currently pending in this application. Claims 1-38 are canceled without prejudice.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC §103

Claims 39-44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over PCT Publication No. WO 02/065667 to Willenegger et al (hereinafter “Willenegger”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,400,960 to Dominique et al. (hereinafter “Dominique”) and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,711,150 to Vanghi (hereinafter “Vanghi”).

The Examiner has failed to address Applicants’ arguments. The Examiner has stated that the Applicants ignore or overlook the Vanghi reference; however, Applicants have addressed this cited reference in previous responses. The Examiner further states that the rejection is clear, but never addresses Applicants’ arguments.

As argued, the Examiner admits Willenegger does not disclose the method and WTRU as claimed in claims 39 and 42; that Dominique discloses a system wherein power threshold levels for a primary channel and associated secondary channel are established from power threshold information received by the user equipment over the primary channel; and that Vanghi merely teaches the provision of power control for a mobile station and adjust the power based on a quality metric.

Applicants' disclose a serving WTRU for implementing transmission power control for other WTRUs including a processor for computing uplink dedicated channel target metrics based on the received uplink user data on the uplink dedicated channel associated with the uplink shared channel used by the other WTRU, and a shared channel target metric generator configured to output a respective uplink shared channel target metric derived from each computed uplink dedicated channel target metric for use in computing uplink channel power adjustments by the other WTRU.

As the Examiner admits, Willenegger does not disclose the method and WTRU as claimed in claims 39 and 42.

Dominique discloses a system wherein power threshold levels for a primary channel and associated secondary channel are established from power threshold information received by the user equipment over the primary channel. As explained in Dominique, column 7, lines 56-67, which reads in part:

[The power thresholds for the primary channel and the secondary channel] are established from (1) power level measurement information for primary channel 202 and secondary channel 220, respectively, received by user equipment 200 and (2) an FER deemed acceptable by user equipment 200 for the service provider. For example, for secondary channel 220, $S(k)$ is established to be 5 dB because user equipment 200 has received information from the base stations (over primary channel 202) indicating that the average power level of signals having an acceptable FER which are received over secondary channel 120 is 4.8 dB. User equipment 200 can thus establish

S(k) to be slightly higher than 4.8 dB (say 5 dB) to maintain or obtain the acceptable FER.

As clearly indicated in the portion cited above, Dominique discloses a UE establishing a power threshold level for the primary channel and the secondary channel. Dominique does not disclose a serving WTRU for implementing transmission power control for other WTRUs including a processor for computing uplink DCH target metrics based on the received uplink user data on the uplink dedicated channel associated with the uplink shared channel used by the other WTRU, nor does Dominique disclose shared channel target metric generator configured to output a respective uplink shared channel target metric derived from each computed uplink dedicated channel target metric for use in computing uplink channel power adjustments by the other WTRU. Dominique merely discloses the calculation of a power threshold by a UE using threshold information, i.e., the average power level of signals having an acceptable FER that are received over a secondary channel and received over the primary channel.

The Examiner has again equated Applicants' target power metric with Dominique's derivation of a threshold value for each of the primary and secondary channels associated with the UE. The Dominique power threshold does not suggest or teach Applicants' uplink DCH target metrics based on user data on the uplink

DCH associated with the uplink SCH used by the other WTRU to output a respective uplink SCH target metric.

The Examiner again has cited column 8, lines 44-58 as disclosing Applicants' claimed method and apparatus. According to this portion of Dominique, the user equipment calculates an updated power threshold for the secondary channel based on the previous power thresholds from the primary and secondary channel, and the current power threshold of the primary channel. It is unclear to Applicant what the Examiner finds in this portion to support his rejection. Again, this portion of Dominique does not suggest or teach Applicants' shared channel metric generator configured to output a respective uplink shared target metric derived from each computed uplink DCH target metric for use in computing uplink channel power adjustments by the other WTRU. There is no disclosure in Dominique regarding the derivation of a target metric for the shared channel of another WTRU from a computed uplink dedicated channel target metric for the other WTRU to compute uplink channel power adjustments by the other WTRU.

Neither Wilenegger, nor Dominique, disclose a shared target metric generator configured to output a respective uplink shared target metric from each computed uplink dedicated channel target metric. Vanghi does not disclose this element of Applicants' method and WTRU either. As the Examiner makes clear, Vanghi was cited merely to teach the provision of power control for a mobile station

and adjust the power based on a quality metric. Accordingly, Vanghi does not suggest or teach those elements of Applicants' claimed method and apparatus missing in both Wilenegger and Dominique. Therefore, neither Wilenegger, Dominique, nor Vanghi, alone or in combination with one another disclose Applicants' claims 39 and 42.

Claims 40-41 and 43-44 are dependent upon claims 39 and 42, and the Applicants believes these claims are allowable over the cited references of record for the same reasons provided above.

Based on the arguments presented above, withdrawal of the 103 rejection of claims 39-44 is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

If the Examiner believes that any additional minor formal matters need to be addressed in order to place this application in condition for allowance, or that a telephonic interview will help to materially advance the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone at the Examiner's convenience.

Applicant: Dick et al.
Application No.: 10/688,223

In view of the foregoing amendment and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that the present application is in condition for allowance and a notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Dick et al.

By /Darryl W. Shorter/
Darryl W. Shorter
Registration No. 47,942

Volpe and Koenig, P.C.
United Plaza
30 South 17th Street
Philadelphia, PA 19103-4009
Telephone: (215) 568-6400
Facsimile: (215) 568-6499

DWS/mbt/tc